



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,365	06/23/2006	Bengt Bjellqvist	PU03103	8056
22840	7590	03/23/2011	EXAMINER	
GE HEALTHCARE BIO-SCIENCES CORP. MELISSA LECK 101 CARNEGIE CENTER PATENT DEPARTMENT PRINCETON, NJ 08540				BALL, JOHN C
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1759				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/23/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LSUSPatents@ge.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/584,365 Examiner J. CHRISTOPHER BALL	BJELLQVIST ET AL. Art Unit 1759

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2010 and 04 November 2010.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6,8-12,14 and 15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6,8-12,14 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Summary

1. This Office Action is based on the Amendment filed with the Office on September 8, 2010, and the Request for Continued Examination filed with the Office on November 4, 2010, regarding the BJELLQVIST application.
2. Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14, and 15 are currently pending and have been fully considered.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 8, 2010, has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1759

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
6. Claims 1, 2, 10, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over RICE et al. (WO 96/27787), submitted to the Office on an Information Disclosure Statement, in view of an article by GIANAZZA et al. ("Formulations for immobilized pH gradients including pH extremes", ELECTROPHORESIS, vol. 10, 1989, p. 806-808). Note that the present RICE reference is different from the RICE reference cited in the previously Office Actions.

Regarding claims 1 and 2, RICE discloses a membrane loader for gel electrophoresis, wherein is taught a method for sample application to a gel comprising:

placing a hydrophilic support that is a sample loading support, wherein the hydrophilic support is in the form of a combination of a membrane loader (page

24, lines 17-18) and a buffer block (page 25, lines 6-9), between a cathode (206, Figure 5b) and the cathode side of a gel (left side of 204, Figure 5b), wherein the support can be celluloid, plastic nylon or nitrocellulose (page 6, lines 14-16), which are hydrophilic, and the hydrophilic support is in contact with the cathode at one end (page 25, lines 19-21); and

applying the sample onto the hydrophilic support (page 25, lines 10-17), wherein the hydrophilic support is derivatized with positively charged groups (page 6, lines 17-19).

RICE does not explicitly teach providing an acidic interval IPG gel as a preswollen ready-to-go gel.

However, GIANAZZA teaches formulations of acidic interval IPG gels (A-E, Table 1, p. 807), where the gels are swollen for use (paragraph bridging p. 806 and 808).

At the time of the present invention, it would have been obvious to modify the method as taught by RICE to utilize an acidic interval IPG swollen gel as taught by GIANAZZA because IPG gels make it possible to perform isoelectric focusing separations.

Regarding claim 10, RICE teaches the loader membrane can have a varying thickness and thereby releasably retain more or less sample (page 11, lines 22-24). Therefore, the sample applied can be of any amount including in preparative amounts.

Regarding claims 12, RICE discloses a kit comprising a positively charged (page 6, lines 17-19) sample applicator (308, Figure 5b) and a gel (204, Figure 5b).

RICE does not teach an IPG gel.

RICE does not explicitly teach providing an acidic interval IPG gel as a preswollen ready-to-go gel.

However, GIANAZZA teaches formulations of acidic interval IPG gels (A-E, Table 1, p. 807), where the gels are swollen for use (paragraph bridging p. 806 and 808).

At the time of the present invention, it would have been obvious to modify the method as taught by RICE to utilize an acidic interval IPG swollen gel as taught by GIANAZZA because IPG gels make it possible to perform isoelectric focusing separations.

Regarding claim 14, GIANAZZA teaches an acidic interval with pH between 2.5 and 5 (D and E, Table 1, p. 807), which encompasses the range from 3.5 to 5.

7. Claims 3-6, 8, 9, 11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over RICE et al. (WO 96/27787), submitted to the Office on an

Information Disclosure Statement, in view of an article by GIANAZZA et al. ("Formulations for immobilized pH gradients including pH extremes", ELECTROPHORESIS, vol. 10, 1989, p. 806-808) as applied to claims 1, 2, 10, 12, and 14 above, and further in view of CARLSSON et al. (US 6,528,322 B1).

Regarding claims 3-6, RICE, as modified by GIANAZZA, teaches the limitations of claim 1, as outlined above.

RICE teaches that the support can be positively charged (page 6, lines 17-19), which one of skill in the art would know could be obtained by cation groups. RICE does not explicitly teach cation groups.

However, CARLSSON discloses a method and apparatus for the separation of analytes via a matrix, wherein is taught a ligand/structure that can be introduced to the matrix (Col. 6, lines 19-21), where the ligand/structure comprise ion-exchange functional groups including anion exchangers (inherently cation groups), such as quaternary aminoethyl and diethyl aminoethyl (Col. 6, lines 44-49).

At the time of the present invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method as taught by RICE in functionalizing the support with either the quaternary aminoethyl and diethyl aminoethyl as taught by CARLSSON because it would provide the positively charged surface that RICE recites for the support (RICE, page 6, lines 17-19).

Regarding claims 8 and 9, RICE, as modified by GIANAZZA, teaches the limitations of claim 1, as outlined above. RICE additionally teaches that the support can be formed from celluloid materials.

RICE does not explicitly teach the support is made from regenerated cellulose.

However, CARLSSON teaches matrices can be formed from regenerated cellulose (Col. 5, line 47-49), which would extend to the materials from which the ligand/structure can be formed. CARLSSON also teaches the ligand/structure comprise ion-exchange functional groups including anion exchangers such as quaternary aminoethyl and diethyl aminoethyl (Col. 6, lines 44-49), which quaternary ammonium would be logical substitute to a skilled artisan that would yield predictable results.

At the time of the present invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method as taught by RICE in forming the support from regenerated cellulose and functionalizing the support with either the quaternary aminoethyl and diethyl aminoethyl as taught by CARLSSON because it would provide the positively charged surface that RICE recites for the support (RICE, page 6, lines 17-19).

Regarding claim 11, RICE, as modified by GIANAZZA, teaches the limitations of claim 1, as outlined above.

RICE does not teach the method as a first step in 2D electrophoresis.

However, CARLSSON teaches a 2D electrophoresis (Col. 3, lines 19-30; Figures 2A-C).

At the time of the present invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method as taught by RICE to make the method the first step in a 2D electrophoresis process as taught by CARLSSON because it allows a better separation means versus a single dimension electrophoresis.

Regarding claim 15, RICE, as modified by GIANAZZA, teaches the limitations of claim 12.

RICE does not explicitly teach the support is made from regenerated cellulose.

However, CARLSSON teaches matrices can be formed from regenerated cellulose (Col. 5, line 47-49), which would extend to the materials from which the ligand/structure can be formed. CARLSSON also teaches the ligand/structure comprise ion-exchange functional groups including anion exchangers such as quaternary aminoethyl and diethyl aminoethyl (Col. 6, lines 44-49), which quaternary ammonium would be logical substitute to a skilled artisan that would yield predictable results.

At the time of the present invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method as taught by RICE in forming the support from regenerated cellulose and functionalizing the support with either the

quaternary aminoethyl and diethyl aminoethyl as taught by CARLSSON because it would provide the positively charged surface that RICE recites for the support (RICE, page 6, lines 17-19).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8-11, 14, and 15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. CHRISTOPHER BALL whose telephone number is (571)270-5119. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 9 am to 5 pm Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexa Neckel can be reached on (571) 272-1446. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. CHRISTOPHER BALL/
Examiner, Art Unit 1759

03/16/2011